:: IJEBD ::
(International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Development)
Volume 03 Number 04 November 2020

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

APPRAISAL ON SOCIAL PERCEPTION PERTAINING TO COMMUNICATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

Norashikin Abdul Hamid[1], Raha Abdul Rahman[2], Mohd Idrus bin Mohd Masirin[3], Muhammad Ikhsan Setiawan[4], Iwan Sri Wiwoho Mudjanarko[5], Fauzilah Salleh[6]

[1,2,3]Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia

[4,5]Universitas Narotama, Surabaya, Indonesia

[6]Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

Email : idrusmas@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This paper discuss what is social perception, social perception aspects of non-verbal communication, attribution and impression formation and also some suggestion on how social perception affected cultures.

Design/methodology/approach: Describe your method here. This research is literature study research. The first step was collected literature that relevant to the topic. The second step was data reduction, that is reduced data and chosen the main data. The third step was presented the data and the last step was made conclusion.

Findings: Impaired social perception can have serious social consequences. For example, an adolescent boy might misread a girl's sympathetic smile as a romantic invitation, and proceed to respond in a sexually offensive manner or a child might misread a peer's teasing gesture as a threat and react aggressively. In these cases, the socially unsuccessful responses were not a result of inadequate social skills. Rather, they resulted from social "misreading", that is, impaired social perception. Not surprisingly, the more we get to know someone, the more accurate we are at describing their traits and motives. Even when judging people we know well, however, the shortcuts we use sometimes lead to mistaken impressions. As these examples suggest, effective social perception contributes in important ways to social success, peer acceptance, and friendship.

Research limitations/implications: This research is literature review research. Further empirical research is needed.

Practical implications: Result of this research can be used as references in appraisal on social perception pertaining to communication and psychology.

Originality/value: This paper is original.

Paper type: Literature review

Keyword: Social perception, Communication, Behavior, Emotion, Body language

Received: September 15th, 2020
Revised: November 17th, 2020
Published: November 30th, 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

The most complex mysteries we face in life are understanding people. We spend a lot of time thinking about others, trying to understand why they do what they do, whether they mean what they say and how they feel about us. Social psychologists refer to this process as social perception and it is a very central aspect of our existence as social beings. A socially competent person can make note of other people's facial expressions, tone of voice, posture, gestures, words, and the like, and on the basis of these clues, make reasonably accurate judgments about that person's state of mind, emotions, and intentions. Socially competent people then use these inferences about other people's inner states to make good decisions about how to behave socially. Social perception is an important component of social competence and social

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

success. In addition to social perception, socially competent people must have knowledge of social rules, roles, routines, and scripts in their social lives. Furthermore, they must make use of this knowledge and of these scripts in their decision making and acting. They also have a concern for other people and make it a habit to adjust their behaviour based on the needs of others. Finally, they have the confidence needed to interact socially and accept the vulnerability associated with potential rejection. This paper will discuss what is social perception, social perception aspects of non-verbal communication, attribution and impression formation and also some suggestion on how social perception affected cultures.

Social perception is the study of how people form impressions and make inferences about other people. People constantly form such impressions because doing so helps them understand and predict their social worlds. Social perception refers to the processes through which we use available information to form impressions of other people, to assess what they are like. Social perceptions can be flawed not only on us even skilled observers can misperceive, misjudge, and reach the wrong conclusions. Once we form wrong impressions, they are likely to persist. The resulting impressions that we form are based off of information available in the environment, our previous attitudes about relevant stimuli, and our current mood. Humans tend to operate under certain biases when forming impression of other individuals. For example, we like to perceive a beautiful person as being good examples possessing desirable personality traits such as kindness, sociability, or intelligence than less attractive people.

Being competent in social perception includes three domains of competence: (1) knowing that other people have thoughts, beliefs, emotions, intentions, desires, and the like, (2) being able to "read" other people's inner states based on their words, behavior, facial expression and the like, and (3) adjusting one's actions based on those "readings". The ability to "read" other people's inner states accurately relies on specific neurological circuits in the frontal lobes and limbic system of the human brain. Studies shows that the right hemisphere frontal lobe is more involved than the left hemisphere of human brain that if were injured, people may have some difficulties with social perception. According to Zebrowitz (2017) people identify how we form social perception is through first impression.

II. NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION – FACIAL EXPRESSIONS AND EMOTIONS

Nonverbal behaviour is used to express emotion, convey attitudes, communicate personality traits, and facilitate or modify verbal communication. Nonverbal behaviour may be facilitated by a special kind of brain cell called a mirror neuron. Many studies show that people can accurately decode subtle nonverbal cues. For example, the six major facial expressions of emotion are perceived accurately around the world. Sometimes facial expressions are affect blends, where one part of the face registers one emotion and another part of the face registers another. Facial expressions can vary according to culturally determined display rules. These rules dictate which expressions are appropriate to display. Nonverbal behavior may be facilitated by a special kind of brain cell called a mirror neuron. These neurons respond when we act and when we see someone else perform the same action. Mirror neurons appear to be the basis of our ability to feel empathy. For example, when we see someone crying, these mirror neurons fire automatically and involuntarily, just as if we were crying ourselves.

Facial expressions are a prime source of non-verbal communication. Hess (2016) believed that human emotional expressions are universal and that all humans encode (express or emit nonverbal behavior) and decode (interpret the meaning of the nonverbal behavior of others) expressions in the same way. Modern research suggests that Hess was right, for the six major emotional expressions which are anger, happiness, surprise, fear, disgust, and sadness. Facial expressions are universal in both respects Barrett, Adolphs, Marsella, Martinez, & Pollak (2019) and with few exceptions, these research result have been confirmed in more recent research (Keltner, Sauter, Tracy, & Cowen, 2019). It is valuable information about others' current feelings and reactions provided by their facial expression, eye contact, body movements and postures (Zebrowitz, 2017).

For example, Ekman & Friesen (1971) study with a preliterate tribe in New Guinea that had had no previous contact with Western civilization found that the tribes' people used similar expressions to Americans to display similar emotions, and that these tribes' people could accurately match pictures of Americans displaying emotions to relevant stories. Wells, Gillespie, & Rotshtein (2016) reasoned that if the ability to decode emotions has survival value, then detecting angry faces should be particularly important. They had Ss pick out the one "discrepant" face in a sea of faces with similar emotional expressions (angry, happy, or neutral); people were fastest when the angry face was the discrepant one. Current research examines whether other emotions have distinct and universal facial expressions associated with them. This research indicates that contempt may also be recognized cross-culturally.

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

Facial expressions may sometimes be hard to interpret accurately because people may display affect blends, facial expressions where one part of the face registers one emotion and another part registers a different emotion. The fact that people sometimes try to appear less emotional than they are also makes decoding difficult. Cutuli (2014) found that emotional suppression impairs memory for information encountered during the suppression and also had a deleterious effect on blood pressure, suggesting that hiding the display of negative emotions may have negative consequences. Culture also influences emotional expression; display rules that are unique to each culture dictate when different nonverbal behaviors are appropriate to display. Decoding facial expressions accurately is more complicated than we have indicated, for three reasons. First, affective blend is a facial expression in which one part of the face registers one emotion while another part registers a different emotion. Secondly, at times people try to appear less emotional than they are so that no one will know how they feel. A third reason why decoding facial expressions can be inaccurate has to do with culture.

III. NON-VERBAL CUES

Frith (2009) findings that non-verbal cues emitted by others can affect our feelings even we are not consciously paying attention to these cues or trying to figure out how these people feel. Non-verbal communication includes facial expression, tone of voice, gestures or postures, body position or movement, the use of touch or touching and gaze or eye contact. Non-verbal cues serve many functions in communication. For example, you can express I'm angry' by narrowing your eyes, lowering your eyebrows, and setting your mouth in a thin, straight line. You can convey the attitude “I like you” with smiles and extended eye contact and you communicate your personality traits, like being an extrovert, with broad gestures and frequent changes in voice pitch and inflection. Some nonverbal cues contradict the spoken words. Communicating sarcasm is a classic example of verbal-nonverbal contradiction. Think about how you'd say “I'm so happy for you” sarcastically. People high in self-monitoring use consciously use nonverbal cues in a conscious manner more often than those low in self-monitoring.

IV. GAZES, EYES CONTACT AND, STARES

Eyes are the windows of the soul. According to Hamilton (2016), we interpret a high level of gazing from another as a sign if liking or friendliness. In contrast, if others avoid eye contact with us, we may conclude that they are unfriendly, don't like us or are simply shy. Weick, McCall, & Blascovich (2017) defined a stare is often interpreted as a sign of anger or hostility as in cold stare- and most people find this particular nonverbal cue disturbing.

A. Body Language: GESTURES, POSTURES, AND MOVEMENTS

Cues provided by the position, posture and movement of others' bodies or body parts. Body language often reveals others' emotional states. Emblems are nonverbal gestures or body movements that have specific meanings in a given culture. Sokolov, Krüger, Enck, Krägeloh-Mann, & Pavlova (2011), findings indicate that specific gestures can have different meanings for women and men. Body movements can convey a wide variety of information, although there is more cultural variation in the interpretation of gestures than facial expressions.

B. Touching: Is a Firm Handshake Really a “Plus”?

Touching is depended on several factors such as :

a. who does the touching (a friend, a stranger or...)
b. the nature of this physical contact (brief or prolonged, gentle or rough, what part of the body is touched)
c. The context in which the touching taking place (business or social setting, a doctor's office).

Depending on such factors, touch can suggest affection, sexual interest, dominance, caring, or aggression. Despite such complexities, existing evidence indicates that when touching is considered appropriate, is often produces positive reactions in the person being touched (Barrett et al., 2019). “Pop Psychology” and even books on etiquette Keltner et al. (2019) suggest that handshakes reveal much about other people. For instance, their personalities and that a firm handshake is a good way to make a favourable first impression on others. Research findings Ekman & Friesen (1971) suggest that it is true. The firmer, longer, and more vigorous others’ handshakes are, the higher people tend to rate them in terms of

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

extraversion and openness to experience and the first impressions of them tend to be more favourable. In sum, this particular kind of touching is useful as a basis for forming social perceptions of others. A firm handshake is a valuable asset, at least in cultures in which handshakes are used for greetings and departures.

C. Culture and the Channels of Nonverbal Communication

Boucher & Ekman (1975) and his colleagues have studied the influence of culture on the facial display of emotions. They have concluded that display rules are particular to each culture and dictate what kinds of emotional expressions people are supposed to show.

D. Gender and Nonverbal Communication

Women are better than men at both decoding and encoding nonverbal behaviour if people are telling the truth. Men, however, are better at detecting lies. This finding can be explained by the social-role theory, which claims that sex differences in social behaviour are due to society's division of labour between the sexes. Supportive evidence for this interpretation is provided by Frith (2009), who found that women's "nonverbal politeness" or attending to nonverbal cues that convey what people want others to see and ignoring nonverbal cues that leak people's true feelings decoding is correlated with the degree of oppression of women in the culture.

E. Culture and Implicit Personality Theories

An implicit personality theory is a type of schema people use to group various kinds of personality traits. Like other schemas, using these theories help us form a well developed impression of other people quickly. Within a culture, many people share similar implicit personality theories. For example, our culture shares a "what is beautiful is good" stereotype, and Chinese culture has a stereotype that describes a person who embodies traditional Chinese values by focusing on relationships, maintaining harmony in relationships and inner harmony. In a study by Boucher & Ekman (1975), Chinese-English bilingual subjects formed different interpretations of the same person depending on whether they read the description in English (where an artistic impression was evoked) or in Chinese (where a shi gû (worldly, devoted to family, socially skilled, and reserved) impression was evoked by the very same description). We tend to judge persons who have one good trait as generally good, and who have one bad trait as generally bad. This tendency to perceive personalities as clusters of either good or bad traits is called the halo effect.

Often it is difficult to tell how someone feels or what kind of person he or she is solely from the person's nonverbal behaviour. As a result, we go beyond the information given in people's behaviour, making inferences about their feelings, traits, and motives. One way to do this is to rely on an implicit personality theory to fill in the blanks. Such a theory is composed of our general notions about which personality traits go together in one person. Culture plays a role in the formation of our implicit personality theories. We form personality impressions with the help of central traits. Central traits are traits that exert a disproportionate influence on people's overall impressions by causing them to assume the existence of other traits. It appears that an averaging model is a more accurate description than an additive model in describing how people form impressions. Our personality judgments are often based on biased thinking. Implicit personality theory is a naive theory or belief system about which traits "go together"; for example, people often assume that all good things occur together in people. Positivity bias is the tendency to view people more positively than groups or impersonal objects. Negativity effect is the tendency to give more weight to negative than positive traits in impression formation. Information presented early and information presented last may carry inordinate weight in impression formation.

V. ATTRIBUTION: UNDERSTANDING THE CAUSES OF OTHERS' BEHAVIOUR

Although nonverbal behaviour and implicit personality theories provide a guide to understanding others, there is still substantial ambiguity about why people act the way they do. Attribution theory is a description of the way in which people explain the causes of their own and other people's behaviour. Frith (2009) is considered the father of attribution theory. He believed that people are like amateur scientists, trying to understand other people's behaviour by piecing together information until they arrive at a reasonable cause. He proposed a simple dichotomy for people's explanations called internal attributions, in which people infer that a person is behaving a certain way because of something about that person (e.g., a trait or attitude) versus external attributions, in which people infer that a person is behaving in a certain way because of the situation that he or she is in.

The primary dimension of causal experience is the locus of causality. Locus of causality can be internal or external. Internal attribution is the cause of action that is internal to the actor (personality traits, moods,

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

attitudes, etc.). External attribution is the cause of action that is external to the actor (the situation, the actions of others, luck). Other important attribution questions are whether the behaviour is stable and controllable. Ekman & Friesen (1971) demonstrate that spouses in happy marriages make internal attributions for their partner's positive behaviours and external attributions for their partner's negative behaviours, while spouses in distressed marriages display the opposite pattern.

A. The Co variation Model: Internal versus External Attributions

Lambert, Kelley, & Hogan (2013) theory of attributions focuses on how people decide whether to make an internal or an external attribution. Additionally, Kelley's co variation model focuses on instances where you have multiple observations of behaviour. The co variation model explains attributions derived from multiple observational points. People make judgments using the co variation principle as for something to be the cause of a particular behaviour, it must be present when the behaviour occurs and absent when it does not occur. Discounting principle is whenever there are several possible causal explanations for a particular event; we tend to be less likely to attribute the effect to any particular cause. The co variation model states that to form an attribution about what caused a person's behaviour, we systematically note the pattern between the presence (or absence) of possible causal factors and whether or not the behaviour occurs. The possible causal factors we focus on are (1) consensus information, or information about the extent to which other people behave the same way towards the same stimulus as the actor does; (2) distinctiveness information, or information about the extent to which one particular actor behaves in the same way to different stimuli; and (3) consistency information, or information about the extent to which the behaviour between one actor and one stimulus is the same across time and circumstances.

People are most likely to make an internal attribution when consensus and distinctiveness are low but consistency is high and they are most likely to make an external attribution when consensus, distinctiveness, and consistency are all high. The co variation model assumes that people make causal attributions in a rational, logical fashion. Several studies generally confirm that people can indeed make attributions in the way that these models predict; with the exception that consensus information is not used as much as Kelley's model predicts. Also, people do not always have the relevant information they need on all three dimensions.

Correspondent inference theory and the co variation model portray people as systematic and logical. However, attributions can be distorted by self-serving motives and by biases in reasoning. The correspondence bias is the tendency to infer that people's behavior corresponds to or matches their disposition/personality. An example is the public's perception of Queen Elizabeth's behaviour in remaining secluded after Princess Diana's death; when the public chastised her as uncaring (dispositional attribution), she issued a statement saying she needed to care for her grieving grandsons away from media attention (situational attribution). This bias is so pervasive that some psychologists call it the fundamental attribution error. One reason people succumb to the correspondence bias is that observers focus their attention on actors, while the situational causes of the actor's behaviour may be invisible. For example, Taylor and Fiske (1975) arranged six participants in assigned seats to manipulate how easily different participants could see each other. They found that people rated the actor they could see most clearly as having the largest role in the conversation.

Thus, perceptual salience, or the information that is the focus of people's attention, helps explain why correspondence bias is prevalent. Perceptual salience works in combination with the anchoring or adjustment heuristic to lead people to the fundamental attribution error. Perceptual salience provides the anchor, and the anchoring or adjustment heuristic leads people to adjust insufficiently from the anchor.

B. The Two-Step Process of Making Attributions

Cutuli (2014) work suggests that there is a two-step process of attribution is when people analyze another's behaviour, they typically make an internal attribution automatically (the first step in the process); they may then consciously choose to engage in the effortful second step in the process, where they think about possible situational reasons for the behaviour. After engaging in the second step, they may adjust their original internal attribution to take account of situational factors. Because this second step is more conscious and effortful, people may not get to it if they are distracted or preoccupied. Studies by Cutuli (2014) ask students to explain why someone did what he or she did while being distracted by a task such as remembering an eight-digit number. These subjects make even more extreme internal attributions than those who are not distracted. Thus perceivers who are distracted will be more likely to succumb to correspondence bias because they stop at the first step. People will be more likely to engage in the second step of the attribution process when they consciously think carefully before making a judgment, when they are motivated to be as accurate as possible, or if they are suspicious about the motives of the target.

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

C. Culture and the Correspondence Bias

North American and some other Western cultures stress individual autonomy. In contrast, East Asian cultures such as those in China, Japan, and Korea stress group autonomy. The question is does Western culture, which emphasizes individual freedom and autonomy; socialize its members to prefer dispositional attributions over situational ones? Ekman & Friesen (1971) found that American participants preferred dispositional explanations and Hindus in India preferred situational explanations. Hamilton (2016) compared newspaper articles about two murders that appeared in English and Chinese language newspapers and found that journalists writing in English made significantly more dispositional attributions about both the Chinese and Anglo-American murderer than did journalists writing in Chinese. The second wave of research has somewhat modified earlier findings. The basic finding still holds that people in individualist cultures prefer dispositional attributions relative to people from collectivist cultures, which prefer situational attributions. However, recent research indicates that members of collectivist cultures do make dispositional attributions; they are just more likely to take situational effects into account.

Members of collectivist cultures, as well as members of individualist cultures, are prone to the correspondence bias, the tendency to infer that people's behaviour corresponds to or matches their dispositions. Cross-cultural demonstrations of the correspondence bias suggest that there is something "fundamental" about the fundamental attribution error. People in all cultures display it; however, people from Eastern cultures also have more of an ability to override the tendency to focus on internal dispositions. It seems that people everywhere start by showing the correspondence bias where they automatically make dispositional attributions about other people. People in collectivist cultures then tend to look to the situation to revise and correct their first impressions, and people in western cultures tend to avoid this second step.

D. Self-Serving Attributions

The tendency to attribute our positive outcomes to internal causes but negatives ones to external factors is known as self-serving bias, and it appears to be both general in scope and powerful in its effects (Boucher & Ekman, 1975). These attributions occur because of this possibility of two categories known as a cognitive and motivational explanation. The cognitive model suggests that the self-serving bias stems mainly from certain tendencies in the way people process social information (Boucher & Ekman, 1975). It suggests that people attribute positive outcomes to internal causes, but negative ones to external causes because people expect to succeed and have a tendency to attribute expected outcomes to internal cause's more than external causes. In contrast, the motivational explanation suggests that the self-serving bias stems from our need to protect and enhance our self-esteem or the related desire to look good to others (Zebrowitz, 2017). While both cognitive and motivational factors may well play a role in this kind of attribution error, research evidence seems to offer more support for the motivational view (Wells et al., 2016).

Self-serving attributions are explanations for one's successes that credit internal, dispositional factors and explanations for one's failures that blame external, situational factors. Hess (2016) observed this pattern in the attributions professional athletes made for their performances. Ekman & Friesen (1971) found that less-experienced athletes, more highly skilled athletes, and athletes in solo sports are more likely to make self-serving attributions. One reason people make self-serving attributions is to maintain their self-esteem. A second reason is self-presentational; to maintain the perceptions others have of one. A third reason is that people have information about their behaviour in other situations, which may lead to positive outcomes being expected and negative outcomes being unexpected (and thus attributed to the situation). People's attributions are also influenced by their personal needs. Self-serving attributions occur when people make internal attributions for their successes and external attributions for their failures. This may be an attribution style found only in individualist cultures. Defensive attributions are explanations for behaviour or outcomes (e.g., tragic events) that avoid feelings of vulnerability and mortality. One way we deal with tragic information about others is to make it seem like it could never happen to us. We do so through the belief in a just world, a form of defensive attribution wherein people assume that bad things happen to bad people and those good things happen to good people. Because most of us see ourselves as good, this reassures us that bad things will not happen to us. The belief in a just world can lead to blaming the victim for his or her misfortunes. This keeps anxious thoughts about one's safety at bay.

For example, self-serving biases can help you to deal with adversity. A study of cancer patients showed that every woman interviewed thought she was doing as well as, or better than, other women in coping with breast cancer, and that belief seemed to sustain them in their struggle. Women tended to compare themselves to people worse off than themselves. Self-serving attributions enhance and protect self-esteem. People tend to take credit for positive outcomes but blame negative outcomes on external causes. Many social perceptual errors may ultimately be beneficial. Many errors are corrected through normal interactions with others. Some errors help justify our self-concepts and worldviews, serving a self-protective function.

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

VI. CULTURE AND OTHER ATTRIBUTIONAL BIASES

Sokolov et al. (2011) examined the actor or observer difference and found that Koreans and Americans both made situational attributions to themselves. They differed for attributions made for the other is that Americans believed the other's behaviour was due to dispositions and Koreans believed it was due to the situation. There is also a cultural component to the self-serving bias. Frith (2009) found that the self-serving bias is strongest in the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. It is lowest in Japan, the Pacific Islands, and India. Concerning to the belief in a just world, Ekman & Friesen (1971) argues that, in cultures where the belief is dominant, social and economic injustices are considered fair (the poor and disadvantaged have less because they deserve less). Preliminary work suggests that the just world belief is more predominant in cultures where there are greater extremes of wealth and poverty.

VII. HOW ACCURATE ARE OUR ATTRIBUTIONS AND IMPRESSIONS?

Under many circumstances, we are not very accurate, especially compared to how accurate we think we are. First impressions, for example, are not very accurate. However, the better we get to know someone, the more accurate we will be about them (Frith, 2009). One reason our impressions are wrong is because of the mental shortcuts we use in forming social judgments, for example, the correspondence bias. Another reason our impressions can be wrong concerns our use of schemas, such as relying on implicit theories of personality to judge others. To improve the accuracy of your attributions and impressions, remember that the correspondence bias, the actor or observer difference, and defensive attributions exist and try to counteract these biases. Even with such biases operating, we are quite accurate perceivers of other people (Wells et al., 2016).

VIII. ATTRIBUTION BIASES

A. Fundamental attribution error.

When looking at the behaviour of others, we tend to underestimate the impact of situational forces and overestimate the impact of dispositional forces. Most people ignore the impact of role pressures and other situational constraints on others and see behaviour as caused by people's intentions, motives, and attitudes. By way of contrast, we tend to attribute our behaviour to situational forces. Why the differences?

a. The focus of attention - we tend to overestimate the impact of whatever our attention is focused on. Because our attention is directed more toward people who act than in the surrounding situation, we tend to attribute more causal importance to people than to situations. When we act, our attention is focused away from ourselves. When people saw videotapes of themselves, they became more likely to make dispositional attributions for their behaviour.
b. The information - we don't know everything the actor does about the circumstances have more info about ourselves then we know all the circumstances. We also know how we have behaved in the past, and know that we have not always acted this way.

B. Motivational biases.

When events affect one's self-interests, biased attribution is likely.

a. Defence of stereotypes.
   People tend to perceive actions that correspond with their stereotypes as caused by the actor's dispositions. Actions that contradict their stereotype are attributed to situational causes. As a result, stereotypes persist even in the light of contradictory evidence. If a female executive cries, we attribute this to her emotional instability; if she does well in a crisis, we attribute this to the calming influence of her male assistants.
b. Success and failure attributions.
   People tend to take personal credit for acts that yield positive outcomes, and to deflect blame for bad outcomes, attributing them to external causes. Attributing success to personal qualities and failure to external factors enables people to enhance or protect their self-esteem.

C. False Consensus bias

We tend to overestimate the commonality of our opinions and our undesirable or unsuccessful behaviour. For example, students were asked if they would be a banner saying "eat at Joe's." 2/3 of those

ISSN : 2597-4785 (ONLINE)
ISSN : 2597-4750 (PRINTED)

who said they would guess that others would do so as well. 2/3 of those who said they wouldn't guess that others wouldn't as well.

D. False Uniqueness bias

Underestimate how common our abilities and desirable behaviours are. People give higher evaluations of their group leadership than others do and think we have bright prospects.

E. Just world

More serious the consequences of an act, more guilt we tend to assign. People want to believe they live in a just world that they want to have order and want to believe bad things don't happen to good people.

IX. CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, impaired social perception can have serious social consequences. For example, an adolescent boy might misread a girl's sympathetic smile as a romantic invitation, and proceed to respond in a sexually offensive manner or a child might misread a peer's teasing gesture as a threat and react aggressively. In these cases, the socially unsuccessful responses were not a result of inadequate social skills. Rather, they resulted from social "misreading", that is, impaired social perception. Not surprisingly, the more we get to know someone, the more accurate we are at describing their traits and motives. Even when judging people we know well, however, the shortcuts we use sometimes lead to mistaken impressions. As these examples suggest, effective social perception contributes in important ways to social success, peer acceptance, and friendship.

REFERENCES

Barrett, L. F., Adolphs, R., Marsella, S., Martinez, A. M., & Pollak, S. D. (2019). Emotional Expressions Reconsidered: Challenges to Inferring Emotion From Human Facial Movements. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *20*(1), 1–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100619832930

Boucher, J. D., & Ekman, P. (1975). Facial Areas and Emotional Information. *Journal of Communication*, *25*(2), 21–29.

Cutuli, D. (2014). Cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression strategies role in the emotion regulation: an overview on their modulatory effects and neural correlates. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2014.00175

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants Across Cultures in the Face and Emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *17*(2), 124–129.

Frith, C. (2009). Role of facial expressions in social interactions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *364*(1535), 3453–3458. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0142

Hamilton, A. F. de C. (2016). Gazing at me: the importance of social meaning in understanding direct-gaze cues. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *371*(1686), 20150080. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0080

Hess, U. (2016). Nonverbal Communication. In *Encyclopedia of Mental Health* (pp. 208–218). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00218-4

Keltner, D., Sauter, D., Tracy, J., & Cowen, A. (2019). Emotional Expression: Advances in Basic Emotion Theory. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *43*(2), 133–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-019-00293-3

Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *36*(3), 398–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2012.706402

Sokolov, A. A., Krüger, S., Enck, P., Krägeloh-Mann, I., & Pavlova, M. A. (2011). Gender Affects Body Language Reading. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00016

Weick, M., McCall, C., & Blascovich, J. (2017). Power Moves Beyond Complementarity: A Staring Look Elicits Avoidance in Low Power Perceivers and Approach in High Power Perceivers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(8), 1188–1201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217708576

Wells, L. J., Gillespie, S. M., & Rotshtein, P. (2016). Identification of Emotional Facial Expressions: Effects of Expression, Intensity, and Sex on Eye Gaze. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(12), e0168307. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0168307

Zebrowitz, L. A. (2017). First Impressions From Faces. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *26*(3), 237–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416683996